

Attorney's Docket No.
BB No. 064749.0141
Client No. PD 02E002

PATENT APPLICATION

1

METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR ASSIGNING OBSERVATIONS

TECHNICAL FIELD OF THE INVENTION

This invention relates generally to data analysis and more particularly to a method and system for assigning observations.

2025-05-20 10:00:00

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

The problem of associating sets of observations from two sensor systems in the presence of bias, random errors, false alarms, and misdetections is fundamental in multi-sensor tracking systems. For example, if two sensor systems are tracking a plurality of airplanes, each sensor system develops tracks based on what is seen in the sky. One tracking system may want to share data with the other system and transmits its current picture of what it sees to the other system. The second system must determine what it has received from the first system. In particular, it must determine which data points received from the first sensor system correspond to the airplanes it is tracking in its current system. This is difficult because each sensor system has associated error, which makes it difficult to assign a data point from one sensor system to the other. Examples of errors may include misalignment between the two sensor systems, different levels of tolerances, and the fact that one system may see certain airplanes that the other does not. As described above, each particular system may have errors due to bias, random errors, false alarms, and misdetections. Therefore it is difficult to simply use a set of data received from the first sensor system and overlay it with the second sensor system.

Common approaches to this problem are described in Blackman, S. and R. Popoli, *Design and Analysis of Modern Tracking Systems*, Artech House, Norwood, MA, 1999. In general, these methods involve separate steps to first determine and correct for persistent bias within either of the sensor systems. Persistent bias refers to a

consistent bias, such as incorrectly measuring a distance by the same distance each time. The second step is to perform an optimal assignment of the two sets of data, which are now assumed to include only random errors.

5 This second step of optimally assigning the two sets of data is referred to as the global nearest neighbor (GNN) problem, and is commonly solved using either Bertsekas's auction algorithm, as described in Bertsekas, D.P., "The Auction Algorithm for Assignment and Other Network Flow

10 Problems: A Tutorial," Interfaces, Vol. 20, pp. 133-149, 1990, or a JVC algorithm to minimize assignment costs based upon Mahalanobis (or chi-square) distances between the observations after bias removal. The JVC algorithm is described in Drummond, O.E., D.A. Castanon and M.S.

15 Bellovin, "Comparison of 2-D Assignment Algorithms for Rectangular, Floating Point Cost Matrices," Proc. of SDI Panels on Tracking, No. 4, pp. 81-97, Dec. 1990, and Jonker, R. and A. Volgenant, "A Shortest Augmenting Path Algorithms for Dense and Sparse Linear Assignment

20 Problems," Computing, Vol. 39, pp. 325-340, 1987.

A problem with these approaches is that the global nearest neighbor problem assumes alignment between the two sensor systems is good such that (i) errors between observations of the sensor system of the same object are

25 purely random (Gaussian distributed), and (ii) errors and observations of one object are completely independent of errors and observations of other objects. However, because of these assumptions, this approach does not address a persistent bias, also referred to as

30 registration error, between the two sensor systems, which is often actually the case. For example, a first

measurement system might be rotated 30 degrees off of a second measurement system. The global nearest neighbor formulation works best when both systems hold observations on the same objects and can tolerate large
5 biases in this restrictive circumstance. In the more realistic case wherein each system holds some observations the other lacks, the global nearest neighbor formulation works well only if there are no bias errors. Many techniques exist to determine and remove the bias
10 errors prior to attempting assignment. Often, these use comparison of observations on well separated airplanes where the correct assignment is unambiguous.

Image processing techniques have also been applied to the problem of assigning sets of observations from two
15 sensor systems. In that approach, each set of data is treated as an image and a peak correlation is attempted to be found using a Fast Fourier transform and convolutions. This results in a bias between the two systems. The bias is removed and the unbiased problem is
20 solved using the GNN approach described above. However, in this approach the bias is cured independent of making assignments and is therefore not necessarily calculated appropriately. As a result, one cannot show that the determined solution is a maximum likelihood solution.

25 In Kenefic, R.J., "Local and Remote Track File Registration Using Minimum Description Length," *IEEE Trans. on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, Vol. AES-29, No. 3, July 1993, pp. 651-655, Kenefic postulated a formulation of the observation assignment problem that
30 incorporates a cost function that accounts for both bias

Attorney's Docket No.
BB No. 064749.0141
Client No. PD 02E002

PATENT APPLICATION

5

and random errors together. However, Kenefic offered no efficient algorithm to solve the problem.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201
2202
2203
2204
2205
2206
2207
2208
2209
2210
2211
2212
2213
2214
2215
2216
2217
2218

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

According to one embodiment of the invention, a computerized method for assigning observations includes receiving a plurality of first observations indicative of
5 respective physical parameters observed by a first sensor system and receiving a plurality of second observations indicative of respective physical parameters observed by a second sensor system. The method also includes assigning, by a computer, a set of pairs of the first and
10 second observations predicted to correspond to the same physical parameter. The assigning includes receiving a cost function that specifies a cost for each assigned pair. The cost is not independent of the assignment of any other assigned pairs in the set of assigned pairs.
15 The assigning also includes determining the set of assigned pairs corresponding to an optimal value for the cost function by calculating, by the computer, a corresponding optimal value for a directed graph representative of possible assignments of first and
20 second observations.

Some embodiments of the invention provide numerous technical advantages. Some embodiments may benefit from some, none, or all of these advantages. An efficient algorithm is provided for assigning sets of observations
25 that accounts for both registration errors and nodes that should not be assigned. Such an approach may result in more accurate assignment of observations in a more efficient manner than conventional techniques.

Other technical advantages may be readily
30 ascertainable by one of skill in the art.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

Reference is now made to the following description
taken in conjunction with the accompanying drawings,
wherein like reference numbers represent like parts, and
5 which:

FIGURE 1 is a schematic diagram of a sensor system
that may benefit from the teachings of the invention;

FIGURE 2 is a schematic diagram comparing
assignments of the data observations made by the system
10 of FIGURE 1 according to conventional techniques and
according to the teachings of the invention;

FIGURE 3 is a flow chart illustrating acts
associated with definition of an observation assignment
problem according to the teachings of the invention;

FIGURE 4 is a flow chart showing acts associated
with solution of the formulated problem of observation
15 assignment according to the teachings of the invention;

FIGURE 5A is a flow chart showing steps associated
with forming a directed graph for solution of the
20 formulated observation assignment problem according to
the teachings of the invention;

FIGURE 5B is a directed graph for solving the
formulated observation problem according to the teachings
of the invention;

FIGURE 6A is an example computer for solving the
directed graph of FIGURE 5B according to the teachings of
25 the invention;

FIGURE 6B is a block diagram of a portion of the
memory of the example computer of FIGURE 6A, showing a
30 node queue and a solution queue used in solving the

directed graph of FIGURE 5B according to the teachings of the invention;

FIGURE 7 is a flow chart illustrating example acts associated with solving the directed graph of FIGURE 5B;

5 FIGURE 8 illustrates graphs comparing the results of example assignments utilizing the teachings of the invention to a conventional approach for an example with no missing data;

10 FIGURE 9 illustrates graphs comparing the results of assignments utilizing the teachings of the invention to a conventional approach for an example having two missing observations;

15 FIGURE 10 is a graph illustrating the efficiency of solving the observation assignment problem according to the teachings of the invention;

FIGURE 11 is a graph comparing the timing of the solution according to the teachings of the present invention and prior techniques; and

20 FIGURE 12 illustrates graphs showing the limited circumstances under which prior techniques might be acceptable.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

Embodiments of the invention and its advantages are best understood by referring to FIGURES 1 through 12 of the drawings, like numerals being used for like and
5 corresponding parts of the various drawings.

FIGURE 1 is a schematic diagram of sensor systems 10 that may benefit from the teachings of the invention. Sensor systems 10 include a sensor system 12 and a sensor system 14. In this example, sensor systems 12 and 14
10 observe the position of a plurality of airplanes 16. Observation may occur through sensing, prediction, or a combination of sensing and prediction. In this example, sensor system 12 and 14 are radar systems for example purposes only; however, the teachings of the invention
15 are applicable regardless of the type of sensor system utilized. For clarity of illustration purposes not all airplanes 16 that are utilized in this example are illustrated in FIGURE 1.

Associated with, or included within, sensor system 12 is a representation 18 of the location of airplanes 16 that are observed by sensor system 12. Sensor system 14 is associated with a similar representation 20. Representations 18 and 20 may differ for a variety of reasons. There may be misalignment between systems 12
20 and 14, errors between systems 12 and 14, or one system may not observe all of airplanes 16 that the other system observes. The errors for either system 12 or 14 may be due to bias, random errors, false alarms, misdetections, or other sources. Representation 18 includes a plurality
25 of observations 22 representing the corresponding airplanes 16 observed by sensor system 12.
30

Representation 20 includes a plurality of observations 24 representing the location of corresponding airplanes 16 observed by sensor system 14. The physical location of any airplane 16 is an example of a physical parameter, observation of which is represented by observations 22 and 24.

It may be desirable for sensor system 12 to provide observations 22 to sensor system 14 for use by sensor system 14. A problem that arises from this sharing of observations is correlating which observations 24 correspond to which observations 22. This may be particularly difficult in the situation where sensor system 12 includes observations 22 corresponding to airplanes 16 that sensor system 14 does not also observe. Persistent bias within or between sensor systems 12 and 14 also makes this problem particularly difficult.

According to the teachings of the invention, observations 22 are assigned to observations 24 by calculating a cost function indicative of differences between observed values 22 and observed values 24. An optimal value for the cost function is arrived at by solution of a directed graph representing the assignment of observations 22 to observations 24. According to one particular embodiment the cost function is such that the cost of making a particular assignment of a pair of observations is dependent upon an overall hypothesis for all assignments. A directed graph is a set of nodes connected by arcs, with each arc having a specific direction. Traversal of the graph is possible only in the direction of the arcs. The shortest path between two nodes in a graph is often determined using a dynamic

program such as described in Dijkstra, E., "A note on two problems in connexion with graphs," *Numerische Mathematik* 1, pp. 269-271, 1959, which is incorporated herein by reference for all purposes. Other dynamic programs, also referred to as network shortest path algorithms, may also be used to solve a directed graph.

FIGURE 2 is a schematic diagram comparing assignments of the data observations 22 and 24 made by systems 10 of FIGURE 1 according to conventional techniques and according to the teachings of the invention. Included in FIGURE 2 is data set 26 and a data set 28. Data set 26 includes observations 22, observations 24, and a plurality of assignments 30 associating observations 22 with observations 24 predicted to correspond to the same physical parameter (i.e. the location of a given airplane 16). Such assignments are made in data set 26 according to conventional techniques. As described above, conventional techniques make various assumptions that are often incorrect in practice and therefore lead to erroneous assignments. Data set 28 includes observations 22, observations 24, and a plurality of assignments 32 corresponding to associations made between observations 22 and observations 24 predicted to correspond to the same physical parameter. These assignments are made according to the teachings of the invention. In this embodiment, the assignments in data set 28 account for both random and correlated bias components.

In data set 26, all errors are uncorrelated so each observation 22 is assigned to the nearest observation 24. In this example all examples are wrong. By contrast,

assignments 32 of data set 28, generated according to the teachings of the invention, are made by recognizing errors have both random and correlated bias components, generating a common pattern, and assigning observations
5 22 to observations 24 accordingly. In this example a persistent offset exists between observations 22 and observations 24, as indicated in FIGURE 2. All assignments in dataset 28 are correct.

Techniques for formulating such an observation
10 assignment problem to include both persistent registration errors as well as the possibility that not all observations 22 are included within observations 24 are described below in conjunction with FIGURE 3. Solution of the formulated problem is described in
15 greater detail below in conjunction with FIGURES 4 through 7. FIGURES 8 through 12 illustrate example results and comparisons to prior techniques.

FIGURE 3 is a flow chart illustrating acts associated with definition of an observation assignment
20 problem according to the teachings of the invention. Such an observation assignment problem is referred to herein as a global nearest pattern (GNP) problem and accounts for persistent errors and the possibility that observations to be assigned may not constitute a perfect
25 subset of the observation set to which they are being assigned. The formulation of the GNP problem includes the following steps: determination of governing equations 40, assignment of the cost function 42, accounting for gating 44, use of feature data 46, and determination of
30 assignment complexity 48.

At step 40, the governing equations are formulated. Assume that there are N objects (airplanes 16 in this example) in space being observed by systems A (system 12 in the example of FIGURE 1) and B (system 14 in the example of FIGURE 1), and each system observes a potentially different subset of the objects. A develops observations (observations 22 in the example of FIGURE 1) on m of these, B develops observations (observations 24 in the example of FIGURE 1) on n of these subject to:

10
$$m \leq n \leq N \quad (1)$$

False alarms in A or B correspond to observations of an object unobserved by the other system. The observations are converted to an M -dimensional common reference frame. In this frame,

15
$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= X_{ix(i)} + G(P_i) + \bar{x}_A; & i = 1K m \\ B_j &= X_{jx(j)} + G(Q_j) + \bar{x}_B; & j = 1K n \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where:

20	A	set of m observations made by system A (each is a length M state vector)
	B	set of n observations made by system B (each is a length M state vector)
	X	true locations of the N objects (each is a length M state vector)
25	ix	length m vector defining the indices of the m objects in X for which A develops observations
	jx	length n vector defining the indices of the n objects in X for which B develops observations
	P	set of m $M \times M$ covariance matrices defining random errors in each of the m observations in A
30	Q	set of n $M \times M$ covariance matrices defining random errors in each of the n observations in B
	$G(v)$	length M vector of Gaussian random numbers, 0 mean, variance v
35	\bar{x}_A, \bar{x}_B	length M bias vectors

The GNP assignment problem developed ultimately relies only upon the relative errors between the sets of

observations, hence the covariance of the relative bias is needed. The relative registration covariance matrix is defined as

$$R = E\left((\bar{x}_A - \bar{x}_B)(\bar{x}_A - \bar{x}_B)^T\right) \quad (3)$$

5 The assignment problem is to determine the correct association of observations in A and B. The desire is that A_i is mapped to B_j given that $ix(i) = jx(j)$, and that elements of A corresponding to an object unobserved by B be unassigned. All assignments are unique, hence each
10 observation in A or B can be assigned to either 0 or 1 observations in the other set. The assignment is expressed by the length m integer assignment vector a with properties:

$$\begin{aligned} a(i) > 0 & \quad A_i \text{ is assigned to } B_{a(i)} \\ a(i) = 0 & \quad A_i \text{ is unassigned} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

15 The uniqueness property is expressed as

$$a(i) \neq a(j) \quad \forall (i \neq j \text{ and } a(j) > 0) \quad (5)$$

After the governing equations are formulated at step
40 a cost function is assigned at step 42. Assuming that all items in A are assigned and following standard
20 approaches for track-to-track association, the Gaussian probability density for a given assignment set is given by:

$$P_a = \frac{e^{-\bar{x}R^{-1}\bar{x}^T/2}}{(2\pi)^{M/2}\sqrt{|R|}} \prod_i^m \frac{e^{-[A_i - B_{a(i)} - \bar{x}](P_i + Q_{a(i)})^{-1}[A_i - B_{a(i)} - \bar{x}]^T/2}}{(2\pi)^{M/2}\sqrt{|P_i + Q_{a(i)}|}} \quad (6)$$

where \bar{x} is an estimate of the relative bias $\bar{x}_A - \bar{x}_B$. A
25 term referred to as an assignment gate is utilized to account for unassigned elements in a and taking the negative logarithm of both sides and multiplying by

Equation 2 yields the hypothesis score (J_a) to be maximized through choice of a :

$$\begin{aligned} \delta x_i &= A_i - B_{a(i)} - \bar{x} \\ S_i &= P_i + Q_{a(i)} \\ J_a &= -\bar{x} R^{-1} \bar{x} - \ln[(2\pi)^M |R|] - \sum_{i=1}^m \begin{cases} \delta x_i S_i^{-1} \delta x_i^T + \ln[S_i] & a(i) \neq 0 \\ g & a(i) = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Equation 7 assumes at least one assignment in a , and the value g , which used in deciding to accept a given assignment: g includes the missing $M \ln(2\pi)$ term and is described in greater detail below. The bias estimate, \bar{x} , is chosen to maximize the assignment score, represented by J_a . The value for this is determined by taking the partial derivative of equation 7 with respect to \bar{x} , setting the result to zero, and solving, resulting in:

$$\bar{x} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \begin{bmatrix} A_i - B_{a_i} & P_i + Q_{a_i} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} a(i) \neq 0 \\ a(i) = 0 \end{matrix} \right) \left(R^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^m [P_i + Q_{a_i}]^{-1} \right)^{-1} \quad (8)$$

Again, the bias is computed based upon the assigned elements only. With no assignments made, the bias is indeterminate. Equations 7 and 8 utilize a simple bias, but could be easily reformulated with a functional bias, such as a hyperbolic displacement as a function of relative position. Other types of bias that may be accounted for include scale factor errors and rotation errors. Equations 7 and 8 together define the assignment score function that a GNP assignment algorithm must maximize. A simplification is available in the special case of homogeneous error variances (e.g., all $P_i = P$ and all $Q_j = Q$.) In this case, equation 8 becomes:

$$\bar{x}_{cv} = [n_a I_M + (P + Q) R^{-1}]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \begin{cases} A_i - B_{a_i} & a(i) \neq 0 \\ 0 & a(i) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

n_a : number of non-zero entries in a

It is noteworthy that the costs in equation 7 do not support generation of a cost matrix as in the classic GNN problem. Rather, the cost of any particular assignment $a(i)=j$ is dependent upon the bias estimate and hence upon the entire assignment hypothesis. The entire assignment hypothesis refers to a hypothesized set of all assignments. The integer programming methods used to solve the GNN problem are based upon independent costs for each assignment and hence incapable of handling the GNP problem. This is a feature of the GNP problem that utilizes the teachings of a new invention for solution.

An "equivalent" cost function for the GNN problem is defined here. This can be a rough equivalent only, as the bias is ignored (the assumption being that the bias is zero). The GNN formulation is in fact found by removing the bias related terms from equation 7, with result in:

$$J_{gnn} = - \sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} [A_i - B_{a(i)}] S_i^{-1} [A_i - B_{a(i)}]^T + \ln[S_i] & a(i) \neq 0 \\ g & a(i) = 0 \end{array} \right\} \quad (10)$$

In general, the residual covariance S_i in equation 10 would be inflated to account for residual bias errors.

After assignment of a cost function at step 42, gating is accounted for at step 44. Gating refers to accounting for non-assignment of an observation, such as observation 22 to an observation in second system 14. For any potential assignment $a(i) = j$, there are two hypotheses:

- H_0 : A_i and B_j represent independent observations and $a(i) = j$ should be rejected in favor of $a(i) = 0$.
 H_1 : A_i and B_j represent the same object and $a(i) = j$ should be accepted.

The gate value g is used in the above test. Given the interdependence of all assignments in a hypothesis, a cost cannot be uniquely defined for any particular assignment. The gating approach presented here treats the change in score when an assignment is added to a set as the cost of that assignment, and hence the value tested against g to choose H_0 or H_1 .

In the case where system A sends its full set of observations, the standard maximum likelihood gate used for the GNN problem is applicable but needs adjustment to allow for the extra term in equation 7 related to the bias. Given true target density over the surveillance volume β_i , false target densities for systems A and B are β_{FTA} and β_{FTB} , and probabilities for A and B of observing a target are P_{TA} and P_{TB} , the maximum likelihood gate value is (Blackman², equation 9.15):

$$g = 2 \ln \left[\frac{\beta_i P_{TA} P_{TB}}{(2\pi)^{M/2} P_{NTA} P_{NTB}} \right]$$
$$P_{NTA} = \beta_i P_{TB} (1 - P_{TA}) + \beta_{FTB}$$
$$P_{NTB} = \beta_i P_{TA} (1 - P_{TB}) + \beta_{FTA}$$
(11)

The GNP formulation is especially useful for a one-time object map handover. Typically, an object map has an a priori defined maximum number of elements, regardless of the true number of tracks present in the source. This corresponds to a lower P_{TA} and thus indicates a smaller gate value may be required than is given by equation 11.

There are $m+1$ terms summed to give an assignment score in equation 7 as opposed to m terms in the GNN formulation of equation 10. The extra term is due to the bias error, and as the first assignment added to a

hypothesis is primarily responsible for determining the bias, the solution approach here uses $2g$ as the gating value for the first assignment. The direct impact of this decision is that entire hypotheses are less likely to be gated out given a large bias: gating out a single assignment that is marginal is acceptable, but gating out an entire hypothesis due to a large bias may not be acceptable.

After gating is accounted for at step 44, feature data may be used at step 46. The cost function given in equation 7 explicitly assumes that biases exist between the two systems in all dimensions of the common frame of reference. However, the formulation is easily expanded to include additional feature data and/or observations where the residual bias is unimportant (e.g., vehicle velocity). Assuming the feature observations are in arrays A^f and B^f with residual covariance F_{ij} , the hypothesis score becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta f_i^2 &= [A_i^f - B_{a(i)}^f] (F_{i,a(i)})^{-1} [A_i^f - B_{a(i)}^f] + \ln(F_{i,a(i)}) \\ J_{af} &= -\bar{x} R^{-1} \bar{x} - \ln[(2\pi)^M |R|] - \sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \delta x_i S_i^{-1} \delta x_i^T + \ln[S_i] + \delta f_i^2 & a(i) \neq 0 \\ g & a(i) = 0 \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Assignment complexity may be determined at step 48 as follows. The upper limit on hypothesis to be tested is calculated from simple combination theory. The algorithm can choose to make k assignments, $0 \leq k \leq m$. There are $\binom{m}{k}$ ways of choosing the k objects from the smaller set for assignment. For each set, there are n ways to assign the first object, $(n-1)$ ways to assign the

second, hence $\frac{n!}{(n-k)!}$ ways of assigning the set. Overall, the total number of hypothesis that can potentially be considered is:

$$n_h = \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} \frac{n!}{(n-k)!} \quad (13)$$

- 5 Each of the n_h hypotheses requires m assignment decisions. A measure of algorithm efficiency is the fraction of assignment decisions explored to find the solution:

$$\eta = \frac{\epsilon_a}{m n_h} \quad (14)$$

- 10 FIGURE 4 is a flow chart showing acts associated with solution of the formulated GNP problem according to the teachings of the invention. The flow chart of FIGURE 4 includes a step 50 of formulating a cost function in a form suitable for a directed graph and a step 52 of
15 formulating the directed graph.

- The teachings of the invention recognize that a chosen algorithm for solving the GNP problem formulated and described with reference to FIGURE 3 requires that scores be computable for partial hypotheses (e.g., for
20 having made fewer than m assignment decisions), and that adding assignment decisions to a hypothesis always results in a same-sign change (non-positive in this example) in score. Therefore modifications to equation 7 are made to effect this condition. First, d_{min} is defined
25 as the minimum determinant of the residual error matrix $(P_i + Q_j)$ taken over all combinations of i and j . This constant value is added to all scores and subtracted from the gate value used. This adds a constant value to all

hypotheses and so does not alter which has the minimum value. Also, the value $\ln([2\pi]^M |R|)$ is added to all hypotheses and subtracted from the gate value used on the first assignment.

- 5 The gate value used on the first assignment made in a hypothesis (e.g., first $a(i) > 0$) is:

$$\bar{g}_1 = 2\bar{g} - \ln([2\pi]^M |R|) \quad (15)$$

The gate value used on the second and subsequent assignments in a hypothesis:

10 $\bar{g} = g - \ln(d_{\min}) \quad (16)$

The score for a hypothesis at stage s , s is the number of assignment decisions made, with n_a ($n_a > 0$) assignments is:

$$J_{s=} = -\bar{x}R^{-1}\bar{x}^T - \sum_{i=1}^s \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \delta x_i S_i^{-1} \delta x_i^T + \ln[S_i] - \ln(d_{\min}) & a(i) \neq 0 \\ \bar{g} & a(i) = 0 \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \ln([2\pi]^M |R|) & n_a = 0 \\ 0 & n_a > 0 \end{array} \right\} \quad (17)$$

- 15 Thus an optimal value for the assignment score, J_s , according to Equation 17 is desired. According to the teachings of the invention, a directed graph may be formulated corresponding to Equation 17 and solved for an optimal value. In this case, an optimal value is a
20 minimum value for J_s ; however, according to other formulations an optimal value could take the form of a maximum value, or other suitable form.

- FIGURE 5A is a flow chart showing steps associated with forming a directed graph for solution of the GNP
25 problem according to the teachings of the invention, and FIGURE 5B is a directed graph 70 for solving the GNP problem according to the teachings of the invention. Directed graph 70 includes a plurality of nodes 60. Each

node 60 corresponds to the assignment of an observation from a first set of observations (observations 22) to a given one of observations in a second set (observations 24). Nodes 60 are arranged in stages 62, and directed graph 70 includes $m+1$ stages where m represents the number of observations in the set receiving data for assignment, which in this example corresponds to the number of observations 24. Each stage 62 includes $n+1$ nodes corresponding to the $n+1$ possible hypotheses for assignment. The node 60 at stage zero denoted by reference numeral 64, is referred to as a root node. All arcs 66 between given nodes 60 represent a single assignment decision. All nodes in stage m are referred to as terminal nodes 68.

With reference to FIGURE 5A, formulation of directed graph 70 is described. At a step 80 nodes 60 in directed graph 70 are defined. Each node 60 in graph 70 represents an assignment hypothesis with some number of assignment decisions. Root node 64 has zero decisions made, and all terminal nodes 68 have m assignment decisions and are complete.

At step 82 arcs 66 in directed graph 70 are defined. Each node 62 in directed graph 70 has a single input arc 66. Therefore directed graph 70 is in effect a tree. There is exactly one path from root node 64 to any node 60 in graph 70. Each arc 66 connecting to node 60 represents a single assignment decision. Thus, each node 60 has one more assignment decision than the node 60 feeding it. A length of an arc 66 is, in this case, the decrease in assignment score ($J_{s-1} - J_s$) resulting from the

assignment decision made to reach the assignment hypothesis at its terminus.

At step 84, assignment definitions are made. Root node 64 has zero assignment decisions made. Arcs 66 into nodes at stage i correspond to assignment decisions on the item in A (system 12). For example, root node 64 feeds all stage one nodes, and the assignment decision made relates to assigning the first observation in A (observations 22) to the n observations in B (observations 24). All assignment hypotheses consist of unique assignments; the assignment decision associated with each arc 66 assigns an observation in B (observations 24) that is unassigned in the source hypothesis. The structure of graph 70 assures that each observation in A (observations 22) is considered only in a single stage 62 and cannot be multiply assigned.

At step 86, a solution of graph 70 is defined. All solutions exist at stage m , the terminal stage, where m assignments have been made.

At step 88, graph 70 is searched for one or more optimum solutions. Only those portions of graph 70 touched by the search algorithm are formed. This greatly reduces the computations required to obtain an optimal solution for graph 70. For practical problems, the number of hypotheses in n_h , the set of all possible hypotheses, is so large that simply enumerating all arcs 66 on graph 70 is infeasible. This also precludes general dynamic programming approaches that provide high efficiency based upon a priori knowledge of the graph. One example of computational approach for performing the

step 88 of searching graph 70 is described below in conjunction with FIGURE 6A through 7.

FIGURE 6A is an example computer for searching the directed graph 70 for one or more optimal solutions according to the teachings of the invention. Computer 90 includes, in this example, a processor 92, associated storage 94, and memory 96. Also included in computer system 90 is an output device 98 and an input device 100. Processor 92 may be any suitable processor including processors manufactured by, for example, Intel, AMD, and Motorola. Storage 94 provides storage for processor 92 and may comprise any suitable type of storage, such as CD-ROM, hard disk drives, or other suitable storage. Memory 96 is often random access memory but can comprise other types of memory such as read only memory and may take any suitable form, including flash memory, CD-ROM, hard disk drives, floppy disks, or other suitable forms. Output device 98 may comprise any suitable device for displaying data processed by processor 92, such as a printer or a display. Input device 100 provides a way for a user to provide input to processor 92 and may include a keyboard, a pointing device, or other suitable input device.

Stored within memory 96, or alternatively storage 94, is GNP software 102. GNP software 102 solves the directed graph problem described above and therefore allows appropriate assignment of observations between two systems, such as systems 12 and 14. GNP software may be written in any suitable programming language; in this example it is written in C++. Operation of GNP software

102 is described in greater detail below in conjunction with FIGURE 6B and FIGURE 7.

Computer 90 is only one example of a suitable system for executing algorithmic steps for searching directed graph 70 for one or more optimal solutions. Other examples include digital signal processors, application specific integrated circuits, and field programmable gate arrays. Other suitable systems that are operable to execute predetermined steps according to the invention may also be used, whether currently existing or yet to be developed.

FIGURE 6B shows additional details of memory 96 of this embodiment illustrating a node queue 104 and a solution queue 106 for use in searching the directed graph 70 for one or more optimal solutions according to the procedure described below in connection with FIGURE 7. Node queue 104 stores all nodes 60 with partial hypothesis ($\text{stage} < m$) that have been touched in the search of graph 70 and are candidates for further exploration. Nodes 60 are pushed onto queue 104 in arbitrary order with respect to assignments, but retrieve highest scores first, as described in greater detail below. Solution queue 106 is a structure that maintains the list of the $n\text{-best}$ solutions. Solution queue 106 supports adding solutions (nodes at stage n) in arbitrary order, popping a best order solution, and returning the value of the worst solution in solution queue 106. Popping the best or worst value solution refers to determining the solution with best or worst value, removing it from the queue, and making it available for further processing.

FIGURE 7 is a flow chart illustrating example acts associated with solving the directed graph of FIGURE 5B. Other known methods for solving a directed graph may also be used for this purpose. Method 110 may be implemented by any suitable computer to obtain the n_{best} solutions for the directed graph 70 described above, and therefore determine the best set of observation assignments for the GNP problem. In general, method 110 maintains a list of nodes 60 (partial hypotheses) formed, and selects as the one to explore from that node those nodes having the highest current score. The search terminates when the selected node 60 for exploration has a score no higher than the n^{th} best solution yet found. This assures finding the n best solutions because (1) all possible solutions are represented in the graph, (2) no child hypothesis has a score higher than its parent, and thus, (3) the termination criteria provides that all unexplored hypotheses would have scores no higher than the solutions already found. In the described embodiment only those nodes 60 in arcs 66 actually explored during the search are ever formulated.

The method begins at step 112. At step 114, the no assignment solution (the stage m node representing the hypothesis of no assignments) score from Equation 18 is pushed onto solution queue 106. This is the lowest possible score assignment hypothesis possible. At step 116, root node 64 is pushed onto node queue 104. Root node 64 corresponds to stage zero with no assignment decisions made and has a score of $-(m+1)\bar{g}$. Then, at decisional step 118, a determination is made of whether a node 60 on node queue 104 with the highest score has a

score larger than the worst solution on solution queue 106. If so, processing continues at step 120. If not, processing is concluded at step 132.

At step 120, the best node 60 from node queue 104 is
5 popped. As described above, popping refers to removing
this solution from the queue and making it available as
the starting point for further exploration. At step 124,
 $m-s$ new hypotheses are formed from the node 60 on node
queue 104. This node 60 has s decisions. The scores for
10 these hypotheses are determined and the hypotheses whose
score decrease exceeds $k_g \bar{g}$ ($na > 0$) or $k_g \bar{g}_1$ ($na = 0$), where
 $k_g \geq 1$ is a factor used to mitigate the order dependent
gating artifacts described above are gated out.

At step 126 a determination is made of whether the
15 new hypotheses are at stage m , the terminal stage. If
so, the hypotheses that survived the gating tests at step
124 are pushed onto solution queue 106. Then solution
queue 106 is reduced to hold at most n_{best} solutions. This
reduction refers to successively removing the worst
20 solution as long as the queue holds more than n_{best}
solutions. If the new hypotheses are not at stage m
(stage s is $< m$) the hypotheses that survived the gating
at step 124 are pushed onto node queue 104 at step 130.
Processing continues at step 118 until the node 60 on
25 node queue 104 with the high score does not have a score
larger than the worst solution on solution queue 106. In
such a case, n_{best} solutions on solution queue 106
represent the best solution, as denoted by step 132, and
all scores have a score of $\geq -(m+1)\bar{g}$.

The above approach may be utilized not only to find the N-best solutions for the GNP problem, but may also be used to generate the N-best solutions for the GNN problem, and may be more efficient than doing so using
5 conventional techniques.

Example results of one embodiment of the present invention are described with reference to FIGURES 8 through 12. Comparisons of some embodiments of the present invention are made to an algorithm that solves
10 the GNN problem described above. That algorithm used for the comparison data, called gnn-JVC, uses the Jonker-Volgenant-Castanon (JVC) algorithm to solve the cost matrix that results from application of equation 10. As this formulation assumes the sets of observations are
15 unbiased (e.g., that $\bar{x}=0$), an ad-hoc solution is required. The approach used is to expand the covariance of the observations from A by the covariance of residual relative bias:

$$P_i^* = P_i + R \quad (18)$$

20 A second algorithm, termed Magic-gnn is used to define an upper bound on expected performance. This is gnn-JVC but presented with the problem wherein the two sensors are in perfect registration due to the effects of a magical genie: in effect, $R = 0$, and hence the problem
25 is exactly the one for which gnn is designed.

All problems explored are in 3-D space ($M = 3$) and have homogeneous covariances (all observations in A have variance P, all observations in B have variance Q). The simple bias formulation in equation 9 was used for the
30 approach at the present invention, the log-determinant

terms in the cost functions for equations 8 and 10 being constants for this case were instead added to the gate value g . Solution according to the teachings of the invention are referred to in the FIGURES as "gnpl."

5 FIGURE 8 presents relative accuracy of the three algorithms for a threat object map handover problem. There are 20 total objects randomly dispersed in a cube 8 km on a side (the x , y , and z coordinates are independent draws from a uniform distribution), system A reports
10 observations of seven of these to system B, and system B holds tracks on all 20 objects (thus $m = 7$, $n = N = 20$). The convolution of tracking errors for A and B is 100 meters $1-\sigma$ per axis, and there is a residual relative registration error of 2 km $1-\sigma$. Thus, R is a diagonal
15 matrix with values of 4 km^2 on the diagonal, and $P+Q$ is diagonal with entries of 0.01 km^2 on the diagonal. The metric is assignment errors: there are seven assignments to be made with an error counted for each of the assignments that is incorrect compared to the true source
20 of observations in A and B. The data is for 1000 Monte-Carlo runs. As shown, the approach of the present invention achieves almost the same performance as Magic-gnn, while gnn-JVC is much worse and clearly a poor choice for this problem.

25 The results in FIGURE 9 are for a nearly identical problem, except that there are 22 objects: 2 of the 7 observations in A have no counterpart in the 20 observations in B (e.g., $m = 7$, $n = 20$, $N = 22$). Performance degrades slightly for Magic-gnn and gnpl, but
30 gnn-JVC never makes fewer than two errors (all seven objects as always assigned to something).

FIGURE 10 presents results from sets of 1000 Monte-Carlo runs solving the problem from FIGURE 9, but now seeking varying numbers of solutions. The data presented shows the fraction of arcs in the directed graph touched by the search according to the teachings of the invention in finding the solutions. This problem has roughly 4.41×10^9 arcs, and in the worst case, about 1×10^{-6} of those were searched, or roughly 4400 arcs, to find the five best solutions.

FIGURE 11 provides another measure of computational performance, this time comparing total solution time for same size problems in gnpl and in gnn-JVC. The problem defined is has registration errors sufficiently small that solutions from both algorithms are identical. The particular problem parameters include:

- 100 meter 1- σ tracking error, 0.001 meter 1- σ Registration Error.
- All objects in a cube, 8 km on a side. m observations in A, n observations in B.
- The timing data is from 100 repetitions of 20 patterns for each combination of m/n .
- Both algorithms are in C/C++. The gnn-JVC time includes time to compute the cost matrix. The cost calculation includes
- coarse gating to avoid computing the Mahalanobis distance for values unlikely to satisfy the gate g .

The key result shown in FIGURE 11 is that gnpl is reasonably efficient computationally for problems typical of handover. For a map of size smaller than 10, gnpl is often significantly faster than gnn-JVC. For small problems, the gnn-JVC solution time is dominated by time to compute the cost matrix, not solution in the JVC algorithm. For these same cases, gnpl avoids exploring a

large part of the directed graph, in effect using smart gating to avoid computing costs for many potential assignment pairs. This advantage disappears as m (e.g., the object map size) increases. The basic gnpl algorithm is useful in this example for values of m up to 25-30, depending upon object density, but could be used in much larger problems depending upon the specific computer used and the problem parameters.

One ad-hoc approach to solving problems of higher order builds on earlier work of Blackman and Banh³. Their approach is based upon iteration around a gnn algorithm. An assignment solution is obtained by gnn, the median offset between the assigned pairs in the solution is taken as the bias. The gnn solution is repeated with this new bias. This is repeated until some termination criteria is reached. This approach is reliant upon a good initial estimate of the bias. A hybrid approach using gnpl has been found successful. First, the gnpl assignment solution is found using some number (10 seems good) of the observations in A , chosen by some criteria (e.g., 10 points on the convex hull defined by A). The resulting bias estimate is used as the initial estimate for the iterative solution using gnn. A single iteration (gnpl to compute an initial bias, gnn assign, update the bias, gnn assign) achieves essentially the full performance for a number of cases tried. This method provides excellent performance for very large problems, with most of the experiments that support this description run using 60 x 120 assignment problems.

Finally, FIGURE 12 presents the relative accuracy of assignments achieved for gnpl and gnn-JVC as a function

Attorney's Docket No.
BB No. 064749.0141
Client No. PD 02E002

PATENT APPLICATION

31

of the ratio of bias (or registration) and tracker $1-\sigma$ values. The problem studied is a 7×20 assignment, this time with 21 actual objects, hence 1 of the 7 objects in A has no counterpart in B. For small tracking errors (the
5 100 meter $1-\sigma$ case), gnpl shows better accuracy for bias errors of about the same value. However, with a tracker error 3 times larger, gnpl shows a decided advantage beginning at a bias error less than half the tracker error.

10 Although the present invention has been described in detail, it should be understood that the various changes, substitutions, and alterations can be made hereto without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention as defined by the appended claims.